



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/005,856	12/04/2001	Peter Zuk JR.		2811

7590 09/16/2004  
Peter Zuk Jr.  
258 Old Littleton Rd.  
Harvard, MA 01451

EXAMINER

CECIL, TERRY K

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1723

DATE MAILED: 09/16/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Advisory Action</b>	Application No. 10/005,856	Applicant(s) ZUK, PETER	
	Examiner Mr. Terry K. Cecil	Art Unit 1723	

**--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

THE REPLY FILED 23 August 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

**PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]**

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
  - (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
  - (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
  - (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: \_\_\_\_\_.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:


Claim(s) allowed: 69-79,95-105 and 119.

Claim(s) objected to: 64-67,86-91,107,108 and 111.

Claim(s) rejected: 58,60-63,68,80-85,92,94,106,109,110,112-118,120 and 121.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
10. ☒ Other: See Continuation Sheet

  
 Mr. Terry K. Cecil  
 Primary Examiner  
 Art Unit: 1723

Continuation of 10. Other: Applicant's cancellation of claims 59 and 93 obviates the objection of claim 93 and the 112 rejection of claim 59. However, the 103 rejections of the final rejection and the other 112 rejections are maintained. Applicant's arguments concerning the new matter of paragraphs 5b and 5c is unpersuasive. The originally filed specification does not have support for the filter being hydrophilic: the term is not mentioned in the specification and applicant's argument that the filter is necessarily hydrophilic because the specification teaches that the filter can be wetted by the liquid is unpersuasive since the filter can be neither hydrophilic nor hydrophobic and still be wetted and also it is possible that the filter is capable of being wetted by the liquid because of a constituent of the liquid. Applicant's argument that the originally-filed specification has support for the seal ring being a non-elastomeric material because polypropylene and polyethylene are non-elastomeric is unconvincing since both material are thermoplastic material that can be relatively flexible or rigid depending upon the method of manufacture. The examiner contends that motivation for combining the references was given in the final rejection as evidenced at least by paragraphs 21, 25, 27, 30 and the first full paragraph of page 7 and that such is sufficient motivation to the skilled man for combining the references. .